Pages 1 - 23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE MAGISTRATE JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY WAYMO, LLC, Plaintiff,) No. C 17-00939 WHA (JSC) vs. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, LLC., OTTO TRUCKING, LLC, and OTTOMOTTO, LLC,) San Francisco, California Defendants. Monday) September 18, 2017) 1:00 p.m. TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS **APPEARANCES:** For Plaintiff: QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART, OLIVER & Sullivan, LLP 50 California Street 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 BY: DAVID ANDREW PERLSON, ESQ. CHARLES KRAMER VERHOEVEN, ESQ. JORDAN R. JAFFE, ESQ. MELISSA J. BAILY, ESQ. JEFFREY WILLIAM NARDINELLI, ESQ. For Defendants MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 425 Market Street Uber and Ottomotto: San Francisco, California 94105 BY: ARTURO J. GONZALEZ, ESQ. (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE) Reported By: Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR Official Reporter - US District Court

Computerized Transcription By Eclipse

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUE	ED)
2		BOIES, SCHILLER AND FLEXNER, LLP
3		5301 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20015
4	BI:	KAREN LEAH DUNN, ESQ.
5		BOIES, SCHILLER AND FLEXNER, LLP
6		435 Tasso Street Suite 205
7	RY:	Palo Alto, California 94301 KATHLEEN R. HARTNETT, ESQ.
8	21.	MIIIIIII K. MIKINIII, IDQ.
9		SUSMAN, GODFREY, LLP
10		560 Lexington Avenue 15th Floor
11	BY:	New York, New York 10022 SHAWN JONATHAN RABIN, ESQ.
12		,
13		SUSMAN, GODFREY, LLP
14		1301 Avenue of the Americas 32nd Floor
15	BY:	New York, New York 10019 WILLIAM CHRISTOPHER CARMODY, ESQ.
16		
17		
18	For Defendant Otto Trucking:	GOODWIN PROCTER, LLP Three Embarcadero Center
19	BY:	San Francisco, California 94111 HAYES PHILLIPS HYDE, ESQ.
20		
21		
22	,	
23	(APPEARANCES	CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUE	D)
2	For Intervenor Defendan	_
3	Anthony Levandowski:	RAMSEY & EHRLICH, LLP 803 Hearst Avenue
4	BY:	Berkeley, California 94710
5	ы.	MIDES F. BIRDICH, ESQ.
6		
7	For Respondent Stroz Friedberg:	LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP 505 Montgomery Street
8	20101 111043013	Suite 2000 San Francisco, California 94111
9	BY:	MELANIE MARILYN BLUNSCHI, ESQ.
10		
11	For Colin Sebern:	FARMER BROWNSTEIN JAEGER, LLP 235 Montgomery Street
12		Suite 835
13	BY:	San Francisco, California 94104 DAVID C. BROWNSTEIN, ESQ.
14		
15	For Intervenor	TAYLOR & PATCHEN, LLP
16	Lior Ron:	One Ferry Building Suite 355
17	BY:	San Francisco, California 94111 JONATHAN ALAN PATCHEN, ESQ.
18		
19	For Don Burnette:	MAURIEL KAPOUYTIAN WOODS, LLP
20		275 Battery Street Suite 480
21	BY:	San Francisco, California 94111 JASON R. BARTLETT, ESQ.
22		
23	Special Master:	FARELLA BRAUN & MARTEL, LLP
24		Russ Building, 30th Floor 235 Montgomery Street
25	BY:	San Francisco, California 94104 MATTHEW CATE, ESQ.

1	PROCEEDINGS			
2	SEPTEMBER 18, 2017 1:32 P.M.			
3	000			
4	THE COURT: Appearances, please.			
5	MR. PERLSON: Hi. David Perlson from Quinn Emanuel.			
6	Here is Charlie Verhoeven, Jeff Nardinelli, Jordan Jaffe and			
7	Melissa Baily.			
8	THE COURT: Good afternoon.			
9	MR. GONZALEZ: Good afternoon, your Honor. Arturo			
10	Gonzalez, Karen Dunn.			
11	I want to introduce you to Mr. Carmody from Susman Godrey			
12	here for Uber.			
13	MR. CARMODY: Good afternoon, your Honor.			
14	THE COURT: Welcome.			
15	MR. PATCHEN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jonathan			
16	Patchen on behalf of non-party Mr. Ron.			
17	THE COURT: Good afternoon.			
18	MS. HYDE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Haynes Hyde			
19	on behalf of co-defendant, Otto Trucking.			
20	MR. BROWNSTEIN: David Brownstein on behalf of Colin			
21	Sebern, your Honor.			
22	MR. BARTLETT: Jason Bartlett on behalf of non-party			
23	Don Burnette.			
24	MR. CATE: Matthew Cate on behalf of the Special			
25	Master.			

```
MR. EHRLICH:
                             Good afternoon.
                                              Miles Ehrlich on
 1
    behalf of Mr. Levandowski.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  Good afternoon.
 3
          So I'm unavailable starting tomorrow, so I wanted to get
 4
 5
     all our ducks in a row.
          So let's start what's happening and then you can tell me,
 6
 7
    Mr. Perlson, what's happening for the rest of the week.
               MR. PERLSON: Well, your Honor, as you may have seen,
 8
     we filed a motion to continue the trial date, which the judge
 9
     has set for hearing on Wednesday morning.
10
11
               THE COURT: But we're assuming today that the trial
     is going forward.
12
               MR. PERLSON: I understand.
13
               THE COURT: Yes.
14
15
               MR. PERLSON: This morning I went and I looked at the
16
     documents from Stroz that have been made available for the
17
     first time today.
                        There are 425,000 documents from
18
     Levandowski. Burnette is about 487,000. Lior Ron, 228,000.
19
     Soren Juelsgaard 282,000. And Mr. Sebern has -- those weren't
20
     made available yet. Apparently, there was some snafu with the
21
     search term, but I'm told there are about 55,000 of those.
                                                                  And
     there are several thousand other documents that have been
22
23
     produced in the last few days.
          You know, in the next couple days what we need to be doing
24
25
     is reviewing these documents so that we can take depositions
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that will actually be useful and be informed by them. I would suggest that, you know, to the extent that we're going to be -start talking about depositions now, with the directive that you just gave, that it's really not practical for any of those fact depositions to take place next week. THE COURT: What about the MoFo depositions? MR. PERLSON: These are the same materials, your Honor, and we need to know --THE COURT: How? MR. PERLSON: Well, because -- well, I don't know how much I can say. THE COURT: Well, you have the due diligence report and you now have Uber's privilege log. I mean, you have the documents that were withheld and now produced, right? were produced on Friday? MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. MR. PERLSON: Well, your Honor, we have got about 5,000 documents from Stroz. We've got to go through those. Those have been communications between MoFo attorneys regarding the facts underlying the due diligence report and what they knew and what they didn't know about what was in these hundreds of thousands of files that I've seen. So in order to properly examine the witnesses from MoFo, who were aware of the contents of these materials and they have been for now, you know, months and months and months that we

```
just found out about today, we need to be able to know what's
 1
 2
     in there.
               THE COURT: Which materials?
 3
               MR. PERLSON: The over 1.5 million pages of documents
 4
 5
     that Stroz just gave to us that were the subject of the report
 6
     that MoFo and everyone else on defendants has had for months
 7
     and months, which we're now just getting.
          So we need to understand the full scope of everything
 8
     that's in there to properly examine these witnesses.
 9
                           I think what we need to do is we
               THE COURT:
10
11
     actually -- the MoFo ones, I think, we need to schedule and we
    need to schedule them for next week.
12
13
          If you find something later on -- because it seems to me
     the most yield is what was on the privilege log that's now been
14
15
     produced and the report itself and all the exhibits which you
16
    have, right?
17
               MR. PERLSON: Well, no. I mean, there's hundreds of
    pages of the documents that they have provided in their
18
19
     privilege that are redacted. So I don't even know what's in
20
     all of that stuff.
21
               THE COURT: Well, that was on their log before.
                                                                They
     said partially produced or not produced, all of that.
22
23
     understand that.
                       I'm not deciding the motion to continue.
               MR. PERLSON: I understand.
24
25
               THE COURT: So if someone needs to be deposed and
```

```
then as other stuff is -- they have to be redeposed, I assume
 1
 2
     you're willing to put them up again upon a showing.
               MR. GONZALEZ: Upon a significant showing, your
 3
     Honor.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Well, I understand that. So I think what
     I want you to do is I want you to schedule -- and MoFo, are
 6
 7
     these people that you gave dates for?
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              We did.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay.
 9
               MR. GONZALEZ: We've given them dates and they have
10
11
     rejected them.
                                  I want those scheduled for next
12
               THE COURT: Okay.
13
     week, the week of the 25th.
               MR. GONZALEZ: That's fine. We'll give them dates.
14
15
    And if there is a date -- we'll give them dates for next week.
16
               MR. PERLSON: Your Honor, another thing.
17
     reminded -- thank you -- that one of the key issues here is
18
     that MoFo itself has possessed, and we only briefly were able
19
     to review it last week, 69,000 pages -- I'm sorry, 69,000
20
     documents, many of which are -- well, I don't know if I can say
21
     the substance of it, but highly relevant to the key fact of
22
     what Uber knew and what -- and when they knew it and -- and
23
     then, also, in relation to the issues of what MoFo knew and
     when they knew it, contrary to allegations that -- or
24
25
     representations that they had made in the case. And in order
```

to go through all of those things, it's going to take a 1 2 tremendous period of time. So I think it's -- if we are going to go -- I understand 3 the directive to do it next week. 4 5 THE COURT: You have your hearing before Judge Alsup on Wednesday, but in the meantime get it scheduled. 6 7 MR. PERLSON: I understand. I just want to say that I think there is a high likelihood that they will need to be 8 9 taken again because of all these materials that need to be reviewed. 10 11 MR. GONZALEZ: Just a couple of things briefly. We made the MoFo materials available last Thursday after 12 13 we left this room. They sent one lawyer over, who spent a couple hours reviewing and then said: I'll come back tomorrow. 14 15 He never came back. Nobody has come back to this moment. 16 documents were there for them to look at. 17 If they are going to take my partner's deposition next week, whatever they want to ask about those documents, they've 18 19 got to ask then. They can't take my partner's deposition next 20 week and then say: Oh, now we've got to take him again because 21 of these documents that they have had access to since Thursday. THE COURT: Well, just keep track. Just keep track 22 23 of the time. 24 MR. GONZALEZ: Oh, I am.

THE COURT: All right? Everybody. Do whatever you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
want to do.
            Make whatever record, but...
          MR. PERLSON: And if you remember, your Honor, the
person he's talking about was Mr. Judah, who was going to his
wedding this weekend and so --
          THE COURT: Hopefully, he got married.
          MR. PERLSON:
                       I'm not sure that -- you know, if he
represented that he was going to be there all day, they sure
knew that he wasn't going to be there all day.
     But, you know, there is hundreds of thousands of documents
and, your Honor, we're going to work as hard as we can.
          THE COURT: And hundreds of Quinn attorneys.
because I see the pro hac vices that are coming through left
and right.
     In any event, okay. Just get those scheduled, MoFo, for
next week. All right?
          MR. GONZALEZ:
                        We'll do that.
          THE COURT: It will be what it is. You'll have done
whatever you've done and everybody will -- it will be what it
will be and we'll see what will happen.
          MR. PERLSON: Understood, your Honor.
          THE COURT: All right. What else then?
          MR. GONZALEZ:
                         I have one other matter, your Honor,
because you're going to be gone for a week, just briefly.
     Last week, a week ago today, document 1504, you granted a
Motion to Compel. We wanted a further response to Request For
```

```
1
     Admission 43 and Interrogatory 29. That was the request that
     asked them to admit that out of all these on-site inspections,
 2
     they found no evidence of misappropriation. And they denied
 3
     that and you ordered them to further respond.
 4
 5
          It's been a week.
                             They haven't responded and they haven't
     given us a date when they are going to respond. I'm going to
 6
 7
     ask that they respond by the end of day tomorrow, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Do you have a date?
 8
               MR. PERLSON: We can do that.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Okay.
11
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              Thank you.
               THE COURT: Your wish is my command.
12
13
               MR. GONZALEZ: Let me think of some other things
     while we're at it, your Honor.
14
15
          (Laughter.)
16
               THE COURT: All right. Does anyone have an update on
17
    how the review of the relativity database is going?
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              I actually do want to make a comment
18
19
     on that, because I think it's relevant.
          If you recall, you ordered that it be ready for review by
20
     9:00 a.m. Now, to their credit, the folks at Stroz and their
21
22
     counsel worked all weekend to get it ready at 9:00 a.m. and we
23
     were told that the plaintiffs were going to have six lawyers
     there. So we had computers set up at 9:00 a.m. for six
24
25
               9:00 a.m. came and they didn't show up. 9:30, they
     lawyers.
```

didn't show up. 10:00 o'clock, and they didn't show up. 1 The 2 defense lawyers were there to observe, but they weren't. Judge Alsup issued his order at 10:23 saying: Folks, 3 don't assume this case is being continued and half an hour 4 5 later Mr. Perlson, by himself, shows up. 6 So they may now be reviewing these things, I don't know. 7 But I just want you to know that we busted our tails to do exactly what you asked us to do and the six monitors were there 8 We even have photos, which we can show you later. 9 I don't need them. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 MR. GONZALEZ: I know you don't. But I just wanted 12 to make that representation to you so you will know what's 13 going on here. MR. PERLSON: Your Honor, we've had, perhaps, what we 14 15 just heard in the other courtroom about half-truths. 16 Well, let's talk about some of the other things that 17 I showed up. I had planned to go there. I dropped happened. 18 my kids off this morning and I -- and we got the order and I 19 tried to do some work and then I went over there, as I had 20 planned to do from the beginning. The suggestion that I went 21 over there because of his order is -- is a misrepresentation that -- and I resent that. 22 Second of all, I got there, it took me a half an hour to 23 They didn't have my name. They didn't -- there was no 24

registration for me at all. I had to sign in on Mr. Judah's

```
1
     name --
               THE COURT: Just tell me now. Are there six
 2
    people now --
 3
                           First of all, we never said there was
               MR. PERLSON:
 4
 5
     going to be six people at all particular times.
               THE COURT: You asked for six terminals.
 6
               MR. PERLSON: Yeah. We said that that would be how
 7
     many available. When I left, there were four and I think there
 8
     were two more coming. Another thing that Mr. Gonzalez didn't
 9
10
     say.
11
          So, you know, let's get these allegations correct and not
     make allegations against me and our team personally when we
12
     were working as hard as we possibly can for the hundreds of
13
     thousands of documents that they had withheld for months and
14
15
     months and months --
16
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  I think we're just going to stop.
17
     I just don't want this to be for the press. It's fine.
                                                               I just
18
     want to see.
19
                     So it's there for you to review now and you
          All right.
20
     have lawyers reviewing.
21
               MR. PERLSON: Yes, your Honor.
22
                           That's my question.
                                                Okay.
                                                       All right.
               THE COURT:
23
               THE REPORTER:
                              Counsel, your name please?
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
                              Melanie Blunschi, B-L-U-N-S-C-H-I, of
24
    Latham for Stroz Friedberg.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just wanted to clarify that we had everything up and running. We had six accounts ready to go. There was a typo in David Perlson's name. The other five worked. It took 15 to 20 minutes to get his working. We actually asked repeatedly for who they were going to send so we could get the accounts set up and did not get that until last night. So Mr. Perlson was online within a few minutes. He could have been online instantaneously with another account. very sorry for that inconvenience, but given the lengths that we went through to get everything set up and screened and ready to qo, as a non-party at that, I resent the implication that when he showed up two hours late and had an inconvenience logging on, that that implies that Stroz was not diligent. That's not what I was saying at all. MR. PERLSON: **THE COURT:** There is no implication. There is no inference whatsoever. It's great it was up and running. How is that? MS. BLUNSCHI: Thank you. THE COURT: It's great that the lawyers are there reviewing. So that's what I want to make sure. Now, let's ask about -- so is there anything else with respect to the relativity then? As far as you know, it's going well? It's going. MS. BLUNSCHI: We --

```
MR. PERLSON:
                             It works --
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. PERLSON: -- to a degree, yes.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
 4
 5
                            You know, there will be issues, but
               MR. PERLSON:
 6
     we'll deal with those as they come.
 7
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
               MR. PERLSON: I don't know that we've had -- what's
 8
 9
     the other one?
                     Equip? I don't know that that's been made
10
     available to us yet.
11
               THE COURT:
                           The Epic.
12
               MR. PERLSON:
                             Yeah.
13
               MS. BLUNSCHI: Epic, that's through MoFo, not Stroz.
14
               MR. PERLSON: No one has gotten -- as far as I know,
15
     no one has made that available to us.
16
               THE COURT:
                           I understand. Okay. All right.
17
          What about the Stroz depositions then, because we had
     always talked about it being in two steps in any event.
18
                                                               Why
19
     shouldn't we get that first one taken of Mr. Friedberg?
                            Well, I suppose we should set it up the
20
               MR. PERLSON:
                We could take a deposition next week with the same
21
22
     caveats that, you know, there is -- that there is hundreds of
23
     thousands of documents that his people have looked through and
     characterized in certain ways that, you know, we need to
24
     evaluate.
25
```

THE COURT: All right. But that was my point; is that it might help your evaluation to actually take his deposition, since he's the one that governed the review in any event.

And we had talked about it and I thought there was an understanding that he would have to sit more than once. I believe there was an objection that was made and I said: Take it at MoFo.

MS. BLUNSCHI: Stroz would -- would object to Mr. Friedberg's sitting twice.

We have talked to Quinn about whether there are particular issues that would sort of expedite their review of the documents that we could answer informally or if they could give us guidance as to what the issues for a separate deposition would be so that we could try to either avoid a double deposition or --

THE COURT: I have to tell you, I'm just not that concerned about Mr. Friedberg sitting for two depositions. I think the burden -- given the burden that's been to the company, given that his company's involvement in this whole case is just not that great. So I understand that, but that's just too bad. I think that just has to happen.

So I want you to take it early next week. Frankly, I would take it this week because I think -- I'm not limiting you to one and that it will help.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No one should bank on there being a continuance. So what I'm trying to do at this moment is get you to prioritize and make sure. And it seems to me, it's your case, that to take his deposition sooner rather than later will help you figure out of all those millions of documents out there, where you want to spend your initial energy in any event. So that would be my recommendation. It's the order of the Court that he sit twice, if need be, and I'm assuming that there very well may be a need. MS. BLUNSCHI: And they would have to make some showing to get the second one? THE COURT: Yeah. It won't be that hard. It will be like: Well, here are some documents that we didn't have or review that we need to ask about. But maybe there won't be, I don't know. MS. BLUNSCHI: We have offered two dates for Mr. Friedberg next week. He's -- he has a difficult travel schedule this week, but we did offer two dates for next week. So take one of them. THE COURT: Okay. MR. PERLSON: Understood, your Honor. All right. THE COURT: Okay. And I think some of the other depos, that you wanted to re-take those, I could see that we can wait and address when I That seems -- that makes sense. We don't want to do him a third time.

```
1
          Is everyone in agreement with that?
 2
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              That's fine, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
 3
          Is there anything else then we should discuss?
 4
 5
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              Have a safe trip.
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
 6
 7
                              I guess the only -- we have the review
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
     of the native devices on hold.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Oh, yes. Right. So what do you want to
     do with that? The review of the native?
10
11
               MR. PERLSON: We'll get our people in there to look
     at them and take them.
12
13
               THE COURT: But when? So you already have -- you
     have the documents at Uber.
14
15
               MR. PERLSON:
                             Right.
16
               THE COURT:
                           I mean, at MoFo, that no one is there
     looking at, right?
17
                             They are there looking.
18
               MR. PERLSON:
19
               THE COURT:
                          I thought they were at Stroz.
20
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              No.
               THE COURT: What about the documents Mr. Gonzalez was
21
     talking about that Mr. Judah looked at, right?
22
23
               MR. PERLSON: Oh, those documents. Understood.
               THE COURT: So I --
24
               MR. PERLSON: Those aren't the native devices.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT:
                     No, no, no.
                                   I understand.
                                                  I'm just
trying to figure out. The issue with the native devices was
the privacy, right?
          MS. BLUNSCHI:
                         Yes.
          THE COURT: This is what I want you to do.
                                                      I want
you to review the relativity first. I want you to review that.
     I want you to take Mr. Friedberg's deposition, and then I
want you to give me a -- and it may not be hard to do, but some
inkling why you have reason to believe what's on those native
is different from there. That's all. Just something.
                                                        And I
just don't think you can do that until you've done these other
things first.
          MR. PERLSON: Understood, your Honor.
          THE COURT: All right. But they are there and they
are ready to go.
          MS. BLUNSCHI:
                         It will probably take about 24 hours
to get that set up in the review room, to have the native
devices, you know, brought in, plugged in, things like that,
but that can obviously be done.
          THE COURT: All right.
     Mr. Ehrlich?
          MR. EHRLICH: Just on the issue of the native
devices.
          It's not just a privacy issue. It has all the
privileged documents.
          THE COURT:
                      I know. And part of that is just going
```

```
to be why it's happening now with the relativity and some stuff
 1
     is just going to have to be clawed back. It just -- it is what
 2
     it is.
 3
               MR. EHRLICH: Understood.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: All right. And those other devices are
     being imaged now, correct?
 6
               MS. BLUNSCHI: The additional hundred that were not
 7
     part of the review are being imaged.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Okay.
                              We would presume that those would
10
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
11
     probably follow, obviously, the native devices that are ready.
               MR. EHRLICH: And to the extent they weren't part of
12
     the Stroz review, it is hard to understand how in this case
13
     it's relevant to claims of what MoFo or Uber --
14
15
               THE COURT: That Uber, maybe. But Otto Trucking is
     also a defendant, right?
16
17
               MR. EHRLICH: Yes.
                                   So --
               THE COURT: And Otto Trucking is essentially
18
     Mr. Levandowski.
19
               MR. EHRLICH: Well, I'll let their counsel speak to
20
21
     that, but he's certainly an important part of it.
          But perhaps if they can make a showing of relevance there,
22
23
     it would justify the extraordinary amount of time that it would
     take to review 100 native devices, particularly if we have to
24
25
     be there to monitor --
```

```
You don't have to. You choose to.
 1
               THE COURT:
 2
               MR. EHRLICH:
                             Correct.
                          You choose to.
                                           It's not an order.
               THE COURT:
 3
                            Not an order. Understood.
 4
               MR. EHRLICH:
 5
               THE COURT: Well, you know, I've also talked to Judge
 6
     Alsup about this as well, so that's where I'm speaking from in
 7
     part.
          So I think should Waymo decide that's where they want to
 8
     spend their time, and they'll have -- may have to make some
 9
     decisions, then we'll -- you know, that may be how we address
10
11
     it, is that you are there.
12
               MR. EHRLICH:
                             Okay.
13
               MR. PERLSON: And in terms of the privilege, as we
     talked about before, that's -- you know, we're going to see the
14
15
     log and look at it and there may be further issues on that.
16
               THE COURT: Well, you've seen the log. You got the
17
     log on Thursday, correct?
               MR. PERLSON: Yeah.
18
               THE COURT: Yeah.
19
                                  So --
               MR. EHRLICH: And an electronic version was sent
20
21
     afterwards.
22
                           So have somebody else looking at that and
               THE COURT:
23
     meeting and conferring with Mr. Ehrlich now as to why if there
     is something that you think -- maybe if there is a more general
24
25
     objection -- well, maybe we should tee this up now.
```

```
If Waymo is going to take the position that they've
 1
     waived -- thank you for bringing it up.
 2
               MR. PERLSON: That's what I meant.
 3
               THE COURT: ...that they have waived the privilege by
 4
 5
     having disclosed it to Stroz, then let's set a briefing -- then
 6
     I want -- let's have that briefed and ready, fully briefed by
 7
     Tuesday.
               Not tomorrow.
 8
               MR. EHRLICH:
                             Okay.
               MR. PERLSON: That's fine. Yeah.
 9
                                                  We will definitely
     put a brief in that timeframe.
10
11
               THE COURT: Work with Mr. Cooper, who is returning
     later today.
12
13
               MR. PERLSON: You want that fully briefed by then.
     That's perfect.
14
15
               THE COURT: Fully briefed.
16
               MR. EHRLICH: Which is when you are returning?
17
               THE COURT: I'm returning on Tuesday. Something to
     look forward to.
18
               MR. EHRLICH: We will make it worth it.
19
               THE COURT: So work with Mr. Cooper, or his colleague
20
21
     here, to have that fully briefed in whatever form the parties
22
     agree to on Tuesday.
23
          And, of course, I will give Mr. Burnette and Mr. Segren?
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
24
                              Sebern.
25
               THE COURT:
                           Sebern, Mr. Ron, along with
```

```
Mr. Levandowski, because I assume -- did they all turn
 1
 2
    privilege logs in to you as well?
               MR. PERLSON: We have logs for most of them. I don't
 3
     think we have them for all of them.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, whoever has asserted
    privilege as to some things, I'll let you be heard on that
 6
     motion as well. Okay, good. Thank you for bringing that up.
 7
          Anything else we should we should set up?
 8
                              Counsel, your name, please.
 9
               THE REPORTER:
               MR. PATCHEN: Jonathan Patchen on behalf of Mr. Ron.
10
11
          Your Honor had ordered that Mr. Ron's deposition also take
    place after the Federal Circuit's ruling. And I just didn't
12
13
    know when your Honor wanted --
14
               THE COURT: No. So that's -- but he's already been
15
     deposed.
16
               MR. PATCHEN: He has been deposed once.
17
               THE COURT: Let's wait and address that when we get
     back because I want to avoid, if we can, three depositions.
18
               MR. PATCHEN: I would as well, your Honor.
19
20
     wanted to make sure we had quidance. Thank you.
21
               THE COURT: That order is vacated.
          All right. Great.
22
                              Thank you.
23
          (Proceedings adjourned.)
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Llelia L. Pard

Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR
Monday, September 18, 2017